DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 300 SO 014 054

AUTHOR Johnson, Norris Brock
TITLE Theory and Practice in Anthropology: Ethnography and Ethnology in Educational Research.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 66p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Anthropology; Educational Change; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnography; *Ethnology; Program Descriptions; Theories
IDENTIFIERS *Theory into Action

ABSTRACT

Using his experiences within an educational research center in the midwestern United States, the author illustrates the manner in which anthropology as a discipline exhibits synthesis between theory and practice. Focus is on the applicability of ethnography and ethnology to matters of theory and practice in educational research. A major goal of the Consortium for Educational Research has been to coordinate the efforts of both researchers and teachers in the design, implementation, and analysis of seven planned educational change projects. The bulk of this report uses anthropological theory to analyze case study data from these nine projects. The purpose of the analysis is to show how patterns of participant relationship can influence school improvement efforts. The projects are described in terms of their patron-client and colleague patterns of participant relationship. Major focus is on project design and implementation. The analysis suggests the need for more collaboratively designed local school improvement projects. Participants must develop and adopt mutually satisfying relationships as a precondition to the implementation of the project itself. Cross-site (ethnological) analysis suggests four strategies for the development of colleague patterns of constituent relationship. A group external to the local school community can more effectively facilitate the development of a locally defined problem-solving strategy by taking into consideration the following: local definition of the problem to be solved; the selection of appropriate technical assistance; pre-project feasibility proposals; ethnographic methods and collegiality. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219300

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Norris Brock Johnson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THEORY AND PRACTICE IN ANTHROPOLOGY: ETHNOGRAPHY AND ETHNOLOGY IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Norris Brock Johnson, Ph.D

Assistant Professor

Department of Anthropology

University of North Carolina

Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

1981

SP 014 054

THEORY AND PRACTICE IN ANTHROPOLOGY: ETHNOGRAPHY AND ETHNOLOGY IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

When thou camest first,
Thou strok'dst me,
And mad'st much of me;
Wouldst give me
Water with berries in't;
And teach me how
To name the bigger light,
And how the less,
That burn by day or night:
And then I lov'd thee,...
Yet you sty me
In this hard rock,
Whiles you do keep from me
The rest o' the island.

From The Tempest
by William Shakespeare

He noticed how pleasant
It was to have someone
To talk to instead of

Speaking only to himself
And to the sea.
"I miss you," he said.
"What did you catch?"

From The Old Man
and the Sea
by Ernest Hemingway

Consider the current conceptualization of the relationship between theory and practice in anthropology. Still in hot pursuit of a positivistic, natural science model of inquiry, anthropology for the most part continues its refinement of a self-image at once theoretically pure and pristine. We continue to be fed the pabulum of a diametrical split between the theoretical and the applied. What is little considered is that the nature of the anthropological enterprise itself is a synthesis of theory and practice.

As a mode of inquiry, anthropology sprang from theoretical efforts to remedy then-current social problems. Enlightenment social philosophers such as Rousseau and 19th century social evolutionists such as Morgan and Marx conceptualized the mode of inquiry we now know as anthropology as the "Grand Search" for the basis of inequality in the human condition (Becker 1971). Anthropology as a comparative, cross-cultural endeavor developed out of a concern with the problem of structural inequality in stratified, complex societies. The practical problem was both on what basis the origin of inequality could best be understood and on how to best bring about

conditions of social equality. The basis of the anthropological enterprise was not dreary armchair speculative debate. The basis of anthropology was the practical concern with improving the human condition--or I should say a concern with rendering 18th and 19th century Western Europe more akin to the egalitarianism postulated for prestate societies. As theory then, evolutionism was part of the practical search for the antecedants of inequality. For the most part, it was only with the departmentalization of anthropology as an academic discipline, and subsequent Boasian historical particularism, that there emerged the conventional polarization of the theoretical and the applied. The split developed when the original goal of anthropology was forgotten. Further, status ranking came to characterize the structure of the discipline. What has happened is that a straw man of diametrical opposition between the theoretical and the applied has been created so that "theorists" might have a structural basis on which to make disciplinary claims of status and prestige. Viewed in developmental context, the point here is that the discipline of anthropology itself is a prime example of synthesis between theory and practice.

On a more modest level, the present context for a more specific discussion of current directions in theory and practice within anthropology lies within the field of education. Cultural anthropologists, in particular, witness a long history of involvement in both formal and informal educational settings (Brameld and Sullivan 1961; Burnett et al. 1974). For example, anthropologists working on educational problems have contributed to the elaboration of theories of learning (Cohen 1971; Washburn 1971) as well as

theories of culture transmission (Kimball 1965; Singleton 1974; Tindall 1976). Further, much of the work produced in this area has been of direct benefit to the educational life of indigeneous people (cf. Burnett et al. 1974). Education is an apt and often overlooked arena for further investigating the relationship between theory and practice in anthropology.

The focus of this chapter is on my experiences within an educational research center in the midwestern United States. Illustrated here is the manner in which anthropology as a discipline exhibits synthesis between theory and practice. My tasks, as well as the goals of the research center, reinforce the applicability of anthropology in matters comprising both the theoretical and the applied. I consider a specific, current instance whereby anthropological theory was expanded in the context of research in a presumably "practical" setting. I also consider the reciprocal manner in which anthropological theory aided the analysis of practice in educational settings. My focus is on the applicability of ethnography and ethnology to matters of theory and practice in educational research.

The following section profiles the nature and mission of the educational research center that is the setting for this discussion. My role as cultural anthropologist is described. Case study data from a major educational research project is presented. Emphasis is placed on the manner in which anthropological theory, patron-client theory, framed the analysis of subtle structural patterns important to the outcome of several projects. Further note is made of the reciprocal manner in which inductive case study patterns suggested an elaboration of the patron-client theory used to analyze the

field data itself. I conclude with observations and recommendations, suggested by ethnological and ethnographic analysis, for improving the effectiveness of educational research project design and practice.

ETHNOGRAPHY AND ETHNOLOGY IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

The setting is the Consortium for Educational Research.[1] Located in Chicago and New York, the Consortium is an independent research organization seeking to improve the quality of public school education. A major goal of the Consortium had been to coordinate the efforts of both researchers and teachers in the design, implementation, and analysis of planned educational change projects. During the tenure of my study (1977), the Consortium was actively involved in the concurrent administration of several grant projects.

In 1974, the Local School Directives Group of the Federal Education Agency held a national competition to identify locally initiated projects showing promise of fundamentally improving schools and the process of schooling. The Agency was interested in supporting intervention strategies seeking to restructure local school communities that could generate self-sustaining capacities for problem definition and solution. Urban education was of particular interest. Agency emphasis was on the capacity to locally develop long-term, institutionalized solutions to persistent problems in urban education.

In response to the Agency's request for proposals, 106 school improvement plans were submitted. Subsequent to an initial in-house

screening, 40 proposals were submitted to expert reviewers outside the Agency. Out of these 40 project proposals, 18 reached the stage of a site visit by Agency reviewers. Finally, 9 projects were selected for a two-year funding period. Each project exhibited a unique approach to the improvement of schools and schooling.

The Agency's request for proposals further stated a goal of acquiring data that could be generalized and readily disseminated so as to render educational research and knowledge more useful to public school personnel. The Agency stipulated that the nine funded school-improvement projects be thoroughly documented. The results of this documentation would assist other local school communities in rendering change projects more effective than would otherwise be the case. A national competition was held to select an agency to document the ongoing activities of the nine funded school-improvement projects. The staff of the nine funded sites served as reviewers in selecting the documentation agency. In early 1975, the Consortium for Educational Research was awarded the documentation grant. A documentation and technical assistance group was formed, and a subcontract was let with the Center for Public Policy and Educational Management at a large northwestern university.

Headquartered in the Chicago office, the documentation group sought to combine educational theory, ethnographic research, and knowledge utilization within a single monitoring project: (1) DOCUMENTATION--primarily employing ethnographic techniques, the goal was to study the manner in which selected local school communities organized themselves in seeking to improve education;

(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE--strategies for assisting other local school communities in the improvement of education would be based on data from the documentation project; (3) LINKAGE--through the monitoring of the documentation effort to link research and practice, the goal here was to increase understanding of the processes through which research can be useful to practice and, conversely, to determine the ways that practice can influence research.

The documentation group employed site-based researchers to spend two years documenting the ongoing intervention activities of the funded projects. Ethnographic field methods and data gathering techniques were employed in the documentation effort. The documentation group stipulated such research questions as: How do the technical assistant groups think schools need to be restructured? How do the technical assistant groups think they could effectively facilitate this restructuring? What do technical assistant groups actually do? What happened in the intervention process? What were the relationships between the technical assistant groups and the local school community? What does the local school community think about the intervention process and the technical assistance effort? Characterize and describe the nature of the strategy implementation. What resulted? Why? What site-based characteristics influenced the strategy's course of events? What was the impact (if any of the technical assistance group?

Site researchers lived in the local school community and averaged

three days per week monitoring the school-improvement strategy. They carried out nonparticipant observation of actors in the strategy, conducted formal and informal interviewing, collected relevant documentary materials, conducted network studies of participant interaction, and attended workshop meetings and classroom sessions. Researchers wrote monthly summative reports as well as in-progress analysis papers. At the end of the two-year period, each site researcher produced a case study on his/her fieldwork.[2]

Coordinators monitored and assisted the work of the on-site field researchers. There were three coordinators, each responsible for the work of three field researchers. The coordinators were selected for their background and training in either anthropology or in ethnographic, inductive research techniques and data analysis. As a research coordinator, it was my responsibility to supervise the quality and quantity of the ethnographic documentation of school improvement projects in California and New York. Periodic trips were made to each site to meet with field researchers on problems ranging from the most effective way to take fieldnotes to problems of bias and entry in fieldwork. I critiqued the weekly fieldnotes site researchers mailed to the central office.

Fieldnotes to be entered into computer storage were analyzed and coded. As a research coordinator, I managed the budget for each site researcher, helped develop ongoing research activity, and contributed theoretical suggestions for the analysis of data. Each coordinator acted as a liaison between site based research activity and officials in the Federal Education Agency.

The documentation and technical assistance group also was mandated to isolate and compare any topics or issues inductively generated from the study of the nine projects. This required the writing of a series of theoretical and analysis papers isolating themes that only became apparent when the activities at the nine sites were cross-compared. The work was similar to cross-cultural, comparative, ethnological research in anthropology. This chapter is the revised version of my final report to the Federal Education Agency discussing some impediments to school-improvement efforts suggested through the anthropological analysis of the nine technical assistance projects. The original report was drafted before the final analysis and writing of the nine site-based case studies were completed. The material presented here should be considered contingent upon the final analysis of each site.[3]

ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY IN THE ANALYSIS OF EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

Cross-site (ethnological) analysis isolated an association between the pattern of relationship among participants in the school intervention situation and the degree of incorporation of the problem-solving strategy. My thesis here is that the pattern of relationship between the technical assistance personnel and local school participants in each project was more determinant of the character, and outcome, of efforts at educational reform than was the nature of any particular school-improvement strategy. The

nature of the relationship between parties in the change project was of vital importance. There are particular patterns of participant relationship that seem necessary but not sufficient conditions for the effective implementation of particular school-improvement strategies. The prevailing theoretical opinion implied in the Agency's request for proposals was that the nature of various school-improvement strategies themselves were determinate of the ability of local schools to develop self-sustaining problem-solving programs.

Many of the seemingly impassable barriers to local school-improvement are cultural and relational as well as economic and political in nature. Cities and metropolitan areas have long exhibited a diversity of culture, ethnicity, and socioeconomics at once serving as catalyst for innovation and creativity as well as for persistent sociocultural discontinuity and discord.

Governmental and foundation agencies, school practitioners, as well as various technical assistance groups, have dedicated themselves to the solution of seemingly irresolvable urban school problems. And yet, fundamental problems persist. Moreover, in many cases the messenger is often attacked in the very process of trying to convey solutions. Change agents are often castigated as "do-gooders" and "outsiders" (Roper and Nolan 1977). Much of the frustration, feelings of resentment, and mutual rejection accompanying educational change efforts are in part due to counterproductive patterns of relationship among the diverse parties involved. In particular, local school constituents (administrators, instructional staff, students,

parent, and community representatives) are affected as much by the character of the relationships with change agents (district officials; federal and state agents; technical assistance groups) as they are affected by the character of various change strategies themselves. In sustained efforts at educational change, it is not exclusively an improvement strategy in and of itself that is either accepted or rejected. Tacit as well as overt rejection or acceptance also involves the characteristic pattern of relationship among participating parties--especially involving the presentation, introduction, and incorporation of a particular strategy into a local school community. Patterns of participant relationship reflect the attitudes, conceptions, images, and assumptions each party has of the other (Belshaw 1970). Especially in the heterogeneous urban school situation, patterns of relationship among parties involved in education change efforts are seen to affect the manner in which both individuals and groups view and value the contributions of the other. In turn, these views and attitudes invariably affect the nature, regardless of the strategy involved, of the project as a whole.

A patron-client/colleague model is used to identify some of the more structural impediments to effective educational change efforts. Analogy and metaphor remain effective methods of presenting disparate data. Based on cross-site analysis, characteristic patterns of participant relationship in several projects were remarkably similar to patron-client patterns of relationship characteristic of peasant and plantation societies. Further, an analogy with colleague patterns of relationship, described by Foster

(1967), was identified. This model illustrates the utility of anthropological concepts and theory to applied education research.

The nine funded school-improvement strategies monitored by the documentation group are described in terms of their patron-client and colleague patterns of participant relationship. Cases one through eight illustrate a patron-client pattern of relationship. The final school improvement project illustrates a colleague pattern of relationship. The focus here is on initial phases of project design and implementation.[4] In particular, I examine patterns of participant relationship, involving technical assistance groups and local school constituents, surrounding the inception of each improvement project. That is, the emphasis is on the degree of local school definition, of problem identification, strategy design, proposal writing, and project implementation.[5] The descriptions are en medias res. Over the three-year funding period several of the projects witnessed noteworthy changes in their patterns of participant relationship. The concern here is not with the "success" or the "failure" of each project. The criteria for project effectiveness is the degree to which strategies were developed at the level of the local school community. The concern is with the utility of anthropological theory for the identification of some subtle barriers to effective educational change efforts. Only nine case studies do not validate the relationships discussed here. The case studies do illustrate that particular patterns of participant relationship are associated with, not determined by, particular outcomes in school intervention efforts. This conclusion is an inductive

hypothesis framed for further consideration and testing.

Patron-Client Patterns of Participant Relationship in Public School Technical Assistance Projects

The Spanish word patrón refers to a ship's captain, a landlord, a protector, and an employer. The connotation is that patrons guide and support. From the Latin, the related word pater also notes guidance and support. To be a patron involves what traditional Japanese might have referred to as "a curse of obligation." On the other hand, clients are customers. One to whom something is done or to whom something is given. Clients are recipients. Clients are guided and given support, defended, sheltered, and protected. To be a client is to be dependent.

Patrons and clients exist in symbiotic relationship. Thus, we more properly speak of a patron-client pattern of relationship. To carry out their role, clients need patrons. To carry out their role, patrons need clients. Paternalism, patronage, and patron-client patterns of relationship exhibit great historical depth and wide geographic expression (Gellner and Waterbury 1977; Schmidt et al. 1977). These patterns of relationship endure because they are functional, adaptative, and of structural social consequence (Boissevain 1966; Gilsenan 1977; Kenny 1960). In particular, patron-client patterns are primarily manifested within stratified, heterogeneous societies among people, and groups of people, characterized by differential access to strategic, socially valued resources.

These patterns effectively order and preserve status and role differences endemic to stratified, heterogeneous subgroups in complex societies. The model of patron-client patterns of relationship is associated with Foster's (1961; 1963; 1967) and Wolf's (1956; 1966) studies of peasant and semiurban social organization. Foster (1967:216) says that:

> 'Patron-client' contracts...tie people ..of significantly different socioeconomic statuses (or orders of power), who exchange different kinds of goods and services. Patron-client contracts are thus phrased vertically, and they can be thought of as asymmetrical, since each partner is quite different from the other in position and obligations.

As it is linked with stratification, patronage exists on many social levels (Landé 1977; Ogbu 1974; Silverman 1965). Patrons serve as intermediaries to wider resource networks less accessible to their clients. Clients exist in a dependent relationship characterized by unequal status, role, knowledge, and expertise. Individuals (or groups) seek out patrons in order to receive benefits, knowledge, and resources to which their structural social position inhibits access:

> With patron-client contracts...one of the two partners is always of significantly higher position, from which stems the power which

> permits him to be a 'patron' to the other...A patron, it is **clear**, is someone who combines status, power, influence, authority--attributes useful to anyone--**in** 'defending' himself or in **helping** someone **else** defend himself. But a person however powerful and influential, is a patron only in relation to someone of lesser position--a client who, under specific circumstances, he is willing to help (Foster 1967: 222).

These concepts are useful to the analysis of group relationships in school intervention projects. The following case descriptions will show technical assistance groups providing information and ideas, serving as brokers to wider resource networks, interpreting specialized knowledge, and bestowing status to their local school community clients. Local school clients seek assistance from consortiums, research centers, and university professors. All patron groups are elite although not all elite groups are structured around patronage (Bottomore 1964). To the extent that clients provide patrons with expected resources, the relationship endures. Clients give patrons prestige and status in return for more durable resources. Educational patrons need local school clients to spread their ideas and strategies. A wide client base is important for gaining fame, prestige, further funding, and sometimes, power. Local school clients provide patrons with the data base on which much education change theory, as well as

patron reputation, is built. Local school clients provide essential situations through which improvement strategies are tested and refined so that, presumably, every participating group gets what they need.

There are problems. Patron-client patterns of relationship are paternalistic, undemocratic, and are associated with stratified social situations. On a psychological level, patron-client relationships breeds mutual resentment and often hostility in:

> situations having potentially anxiety producing qualities, personal influence from high status individuals may produce considerable tension because of the prestige involved on one individual being of higher status. Also, a large disparity in status between individuals may create anxiety because of the tension produced by communication between individuals of different backgrounds (Havelock 1969:5-14).

The varied cultural, social, and educational differences between participants in urban school improvement projects can generate mutual estrangement, distrust, and hostility. The following cases show that patrons often feel they are supposed to "do everything." That clients are ungrateful. Clients often feel they are seen as "children." Notice that clients speak of feeling disparaged, demeaned, slighted, disrespected, not "taken seriously," of being "talked down to," of their implied devaluation, and of ideas being "laid on" them by "outsiders." These feelings are not the

result of any particular school-improvement strategy but rather are a reflex of the patron-client relationship structuring participant interactions in the project itself. Mutual hostility and resentment proliferate. If such projects do not fail, they will be seriously hampered by lack of cooperation. Yet, local school communities do need the resources to which patron groups have access. Educational patron groups do need local school communities. The following case examples illustrate how patterns of patron/client relationship impair the effectiveness of various school-improvement strategies.

Case Number 1: The Business/Education Coalition Project

The Coalition for Business and Education Collaboration is a consulting consortium of over two hundred bankers, corporation representatives, and business leaders. Established in 1965 in New York, the Coalition was founded on the belief that the proper application of business management techniques might be a unique solution to problems in the administration of urban educational systems. In 1969, the Coalition contracted with Justificble Futures in Education, an educational research firm, to test the feasibility of an education/business partnership in two selected urban high schools. The pilot study was successful. Urban school administrators embraced the business management techniques. In 1970, the New York City Board of Education asked the Coalition to establish

partnerships with 10 other public schools. Two high schools were selected. On the basis of continuing experience in these schools, in 1974 the Coalition responded to the Federal Education Agency request for funding proposal and received a grant to extend its improvement strategy into four additional urban high schools.

There were two historical phases in the Coalition's school-improvement strategy: an initial Collaborative Planning Project and a subsequent Self-Improvement Project. The initial proposal to the Federal Education Agency was based on a participant planning model of educational change. Public school personnel were the constituents and were to be involved in goal setting, program and staff development as well as in the final evaluation of the project. The Coalition identified school constituents primarily as teachers and parents. Business consultants from the Coalition would be placed in each high school only at the request of school constituents themselves. As the project progressed, the Coalition submitted a renewal proposal stressing the improvement of internal management and decision-making agencies; namely principals and vice principals. In this sense, the initial broad-based, collaborative strategy was abandoned.

The Coalition went on to expand its strategy to include 23 high schools. The Federal Education Agency placed primary concern on a broad-based local problem-solving strategy. Local school constituents such as teachers, parents, students, and administrators were to be colleagues in the definition of problems and of appropriate problem-solving strategies. However, the Coalition's school-improvement strategy was

conceived of and designed by representatives from Justifiable Futures in Education with organizational development and business management techniques, as an appropriate problem-solving strategy, defined apart from collaboration with local school constituents. Project development constituents were business, industrial, and educational elites. One professional group collaborated with another.

The subsequent shift in the Coalition's strategy was in part a recognition of the failure to meet this funding mandate. Local school constituents argued a need for parent/community participation in project planning and problem definition. The Coalition, the technical assistance group, presented an administrative development strategy to its clients. Local school constituents argued for greater project emphasis on the improvement of reading and mathematics programs. The Coalition imposed an institutional development strategy focusing on the improvement of management skills. It is not surprising to find the following passage in a researcher's field notes:

> A participant responded that in observing the participation of principals present in the workshop, there seemed to be some resistance to organizational development concepts.... Other participants stated that they too were resistant to many organizational development concepts due to what they perceived as an effort on the part of the technical assistance group to be

'manipulative' (Davis 1977).[6]

The administrative sector of the local schools, as well as other local constituent groups, were not involved in the design of the school-improvement strategy. The technical assistance group was recognized as extending, in patron-client fashion, a problem-solving strategy onto passive clients.

Case Number 2: The Teacher Development Cooperative Project

The Teacher Development Cooperative, the research component of Partners in Educational Reform, is a nonprofit teacher center serving public and private schools in the metropolitan Washington area. Founded in 1970, the Cooperative focuses on staff training in needs assessment techniques and problem-identification processes through workshops, seminars, and on-site technical assistance. The Cooperative's professed expertise had been teacher development and techniques for improving elementary school reading and writing. In 1974, the Cooperative drafted a problem-solving strategy in response to the Federal Education Agencies request for proposals.

The Cooperative's proposed strategy was the training of public school principals in management-by-objectives techniques. The school improvement focus was on processes of problem identification, management training, and evaluation techniques. The objective was to increase the effectiveness of principals in problem-solving design and implementation. Subsequently, principals would then extend these skills so as to involve other participants in on-going processes of goal setting, needs analysis, problem solving, and

decision making. Each of the three project schools had worked with the Cooperative on a previous school improvement project. Each school principal had previously participated in workshops and had expressed interest in increasing management effectiveness in his/her school.

This strategy also exhibits a patron-client pattern of relationship. In both instances, the funded strategy employed principals as brokers. A broad-based participant input into the design of the problem focus or the problem-solving strategy was not sought. The technical assistance group only collaborated with principals. There was only a single entry path to the local school constituency. Further, the principals themselves were for the most part peripheral to the initial design of the problem-solving strategy, as well as ongoing project implementation:

> Decisions on lines of communication and timing of interventions were made by a group that included neither the project director, who was to implement them, nor representatives of teachers, parents, community people, or students (Gordon 1977: 14).

Inevitably, this pattern of relationship produced a gap between intent and practice:

> On the one hand, the technical assistance group (the Cooperative) saw itself fostering innovation and renewal capability by changing current hierarchical leadership patterns and unilateral

> decision-making to a system with broader distribution of responsibility.... On the other hand, the technical assistance group's strategy reinforced the top of the hierarchy's authority by making it the primary vehicle of change (Ibid.)

In other words, the pattern of relationship among participants was school administrators as clients to the technical assistance group as patrons. In hierarchical fashion, administrators became patrons to other local school constituents as clients. The technical assistance group developed this strategy without sustained participant collaboration. The school-improvement strategy was never completely understood or accepted by local constituents in the three public schools. The irony is that the project's rationale was collaborative (colleague) decision making:

> That objectives are written from the point of view of the TAG (Technical Assistance Group), not of the client, underlines the contradiction of 'demonstrating' a change strategy that depends on initiation and conceptualization by the target group. It heightens the irony of a proposal based on collaboration being developed without substantive involvement of its target group, the school people, and without a clear strategy for involving the group targeted for change (Gordon 1976: 16).

The technical assistance group did not spend prepoposal data-gathering time in the site schools. Having previously worked with the site schools, the technical assistance group assumed that their problem orientation would remain the same in the new project. Client needs and problematics were assumed. The Cooperative bypassed the problem definition suggested by their clients. This project did not reflect the mandate of the Federal Education Agency to develop collaborative school improvement strategies.

Case Number 3: The Inner City Consortium Project

Founded in 1968, the Inner City Consortium is an association of business, industrial, educational, and community groups. By 1970, the Consortium had developed a decentralization school improvement strategy in two New York City high schools. In New York, Central University's School of Education became interested in developing methods of satisfying the varied needs of local schools in coordinating the efforts of educational change programs as well as in facilitating the effective employment of University resources in projects for educational change. With the University's School of Education, the Consortium developed workshops in alternative education projects so as to further refine its school decentralization strategy.

In 1968, the subsequent target school independently conceived and implemented its own decentralization strategy. In searching out consultants, the school was impressed by the Consortium/Central University demonstration

workshops. In responding to the Federal Education Agency's request for proposals, the subsequent project director, a Consortium official, drafted the main funding proposal. The Consortium became the technical assistance group. Central University and a local community school district were designated project collaborators. Implementation collaboration was between the Consortium and the New York City Board of Education's Division of Educational Planning and Support.

This project's school-improvement strategy emphasized the restructuring of organizational and management components in the target school. The technical assistance group sought to develop a supportive process assisting sites in the implementation of a subschool, decentralization model as the basis for institution renewal. The reorganization model was a linked series of subschools housed in a common building. School architecture defined the existence of four self-contained administrative units; one subschool on each floor. Each floor would plan its own curriculum. Jointly, physical education, languages, and material resources would operate across subschool lines. A curriculum resource center would serve the staff development needs of all four subschools. The project objective was to increase teacher decision making through administrative decentralization. A more broad based constituency was to assume responsibility for educational planning and management. To this end, an advisory body representative of various local school constituents was designated to manage the grant.

Again, we are presented with an instance of collaboration being phrased horizontally between educational, social scientific, and business

elites. Local school participants complained of having little or no influence on the definition of project problems and strategy. Participants, including the principal, were "informed" that a proposal based on the school's work had been submitted to the Federal Education Agency. Anger was expressed at the technical assistance group's making decisions about "their" project on the basis of so little contact with or knowledge about the school itself. Since patronage involves clients giving prestige for services rendered by a patron, the technical assistance group was undoubtedly later rejected in part because they failed to fulfill patron-like obligations. Overextended in other projects, the Consortium did not deliver expected face-to-face expertise, knowledge, skills, or resources. Spending less and less time at the site, the technical assistance staff relied on the principal-as-broker. School participants also resisted appointed technical assistance representatives.

Patronization involves continuing efforts to garner client support often at the expense of the client. This accounts for client feelings of being "exploited." They felt the technical assistance group wanted to increase its prestige through identification with and ownership of an already successful strategy. Additionally, constituents felt the technical assistance people "used the wrong approach" in assuming a leadership rather than assistance role. The technical assistance people "came in with all the answers," "talked down to us," "treated us like children," and "patronized us." There were complaints of being manipulated, of feeling "like puppets," of having a proposal, a funded project, a set of ideas and

procedures, and a group of people "laid on" them. Local school constituents felt the technical assistance people were trying to impose their own problems and direction--that their activities did not reflect local school needs. Local school participants felt they completed the grant in spite of the technical assistance group. Thus, clients and the Consortium had differing opinions of the "success" of the project.

Case Number 4: The Louisville Collaboration Project

In 1970, the Louisville school system established an Organizational Development Department composed of professional consultants routinely assisting school administrators in problem-identification and problem-solving. In 1974, several members of the Department became the technical assistance group for a new school-improvement project. Collaborative consultation was provided by the director of the Louisville Public School's Urban Education Center, the University of Louisville, and the University of Barrington. The project proposal was conceived, developed, and drafted by the initial project director, a departmental staff member, and the Louisville Public Schools Assistant Superintendent for Organizational Development.

Similar to the Consortium strategy, this project sought the development and implementation of a decentralized problem-solving mode. The technical assistance group sought to more effectively foster feelings of ownership and responsibility for local school/community objectives and improvement

strategies. The goal was to institutionalize a process whereby traditional client groups such as parents, students, and community representatives became collaborative colleagues in planning educational change projects. The assumption was that traditional organizational development models designate one group to develop change strategies that would then be extended to other constituents not involved in their development. It was assumed that constituent involvement in the conception and design of change projects would enhance identification and ownership. The technical assistance group served as consultants to key school personnel, training them in techniques of problem identification, conflict management, goal setting, decision making, and intervention assessment.

This project effectively illustrates the distinction between strategy intent and result. In part, this gap is an inevitable result of a patron-client pattern of relationship. In spite of its professed intent, this project did not substantively collaborate with participants in the preimplementation conception and identification of school problems or in the design of the problem-solving strategy. It is again ironic that the goal and philosophy of the technical assistance group was the development and implementation of a collaborative decision making model:

> The TAG's (Technical Assistance Group) Phase I proposal asserts that the failure of urban school systems to solve the problems plaguing them was a result of the process by which solutions have been developed and implemented rather than as a

> result of the solutions themselves....one in which professional educational administrators define problems and construct solutions which must be implemented by others (e.g., staff, students, parents, or community members). Such programs are eventually doomed to failure because those people who are responsible for their implementation do not see solutions as 'theirs' and, therefore, do not see themselves as responsible for the program's success (Brown 1977: 6).

As patrons, the technical assistance group themselves became an example of what their goal statement said should not be done. Initial problem-setting and strategy design was a process of patron collaboration:

> In fact, the development of the project fits clearly the 'role-centered' model of decision-making in that the problems were defined and the strategy was developed by a group of Central Office experts, which the technical assistance group asserted was the problem in the first place (Brown 1977: 41-42).

The predictable result was that clients, both staff and parents, came to feel that the project did not reflect their problems but was something "laid on" them. Something imposed. The intervention entry level remained with the principal. No consulting was done at the local level. The

technical assistance group puzzled over the lack of client response and involvement:

> Prior to the start of the project, the technical assistance group had no history of involvement with the target schools.... Although the Principal's knowledge of organizational development was already known, their interest in having the project in their schools was apparently just assumed....Dr. Winter (Washington Principal) was angry when he found out that he had not been consulted or notified about the project in the planning stages....As for parents, those at Jensen (project school) knew nothing about the project. Those at Washington (project school) looked on it as a source of funds for workshops and other projects, but they were uncertain about the role of the consultants (Brown 1977:8;41).

The technical assistance people did though, hold meetings for local clients, although few attended these meetings or took them seriously. This project's clients never understood the project: its goals, purpose, or language. It is reported that clients felt patronized, "looked down upon."

In isolation, with no site-specific knowledge of the project school, the technical assistance group developed its school-improvement strategy.

Further, there was no project accountability to local school communities. The technical assistance group was accountable only to the Superintendent of Schools. In seeking legitimacy, the technical assistance group itself became a client to this more powerful patron.

Case Number 5: The El Dorado Faculty Development Project

The Louisville project effectively illustrates the discontinuities inherent in patron-client postures in school intervention processes. This fifth case study illustrates a similar pattern of group relationship. The El Dorado Teachers Institute is a nonprofit West Coast research and development group within the statewide Teachers Association. For several years, the Institute administered its teacher involvement and governance strategy in area schools. Through Federal Education Agency funding, the Institute sought to extend and refine its existing strategy. The principal investigator, an Association staff member, wrote the project proposal. A feasibility team identified target schools and developed implementation strategy. The project's goals were to increase teacher participation in decision making and to improve management skills. Through workshops teacher representatives were trained in the design and implementation of school governance structures. The assumption was that the development of formal constitutions and contracts insured the proper collaborative governance of individual school buildings. Returning to their local schools, teacher representatives developed, within existing administrative frameworks,

a teacher governance structure. The technical assistance group assumed an advisory and consultant role. Local school governance structures were determined by teacher-directed needs analysis and planning.

The technical assistance group was composed of homogeneous peer elites. Decision making and collaboration was limited to this group. Quite often in education-change projects, "collaboration" actually refers only to the pattern of peer interaction as illustrated here. The project made no serious attempt to involve a broad-based constituency in its activities. The link to the educational system was through past teacher association presidents unfamiliar with current site specifics. While previously involved in school district affairs, the technical assistance group had no prior involvement with individual schools themselves. Teacher representatives were not elected by their schools but were appointed by past teacher association presidents. The projects came to be associated with a particular group of teachers:

> The expert/colleague issue is extremely important in the larger context of educational change. School staffs resist experts. In fact, they all appear to loathe the idea of someone suggesting to them how to do something (Clark 1977).

Projects were seen by respective clients as the "brainchild of an elite group of Association members." The lack of teacher participation in 1975 almost caused the project to be terminated.

Case Number 6: The Neighborhood Committee for Educational Improvement Project

The Neighborhood Committee for Educational Improvement is a constituent-elected representative community education institution. In 1967, the East Town Parents Association negotiated with the New York City Board of Education to construct a community school at the site of an urban renewal project. In collaboration with a neighboring (Parkville) community group, they took the name Educational Improvement Committee. In collaboration with the Board of Education, the group designated a planning staff and hired two academic consultants. In 1970, the planning committee submitted a proposal to the school board requesting the establishment of a secondary educational facility. Building upon previous experience, in 1974 the Committee asked the Federal Education Agency for a grant to further institutionalize the alternative high school.

This project was based on the belief that schooling is a collaborative process. Schooling is deemed "successful" to the extent that all relevant constituents--parents, staff, administrators, and community persons--directly participate in the educational process. The purpose of the project was the maintenance of a comprehensive educational facility. The technical-assistance strategy was to develop a more encompassing and elaborate governance structure better utilizing constituent resources. A developed committee structure would provide a mechanism for collaborative planning and decision making. Yet, 10 years later, the project is on the

verge of collapse.

Underlying collaboration assertions is a familiar pattern of patron-client relationship. The project's strategy emerged from a group of white, highly schooled Parkville parents and similarly educated blacks and hispanics from East Town. A superficial overlay of color and geography masked a relationship between two elite groups. Collaboration was phrased within similar groups rather than between dissimilar groups. Discontinuities--language, class, socioeconomic status, culture--were established between this group and other participants. This project illustrates how the gap between the schooled and the unschooled varies with class and cultural divisions within the same color groups. The technical assistance group and their clients were of the same color. Yet, this fact did not influence the nature of the project. School constituent groups are not monolithic--either by class, ideology, or color. Ethnic diversity often masks ideological similarity. Only after the project's problem focus and strategy had been defined by this elite group did they seek out client approval:

> When they received a paper in the mail, they were uncertain as to whether it was really a proposal or a directive being 'laid on' them by 'outsiders.' In another instance, at a school meeting to discuss the proposal, a City community representative charged, 'This proposal is the "do-gooder" trying to tell the people what they need.' (Paoli 1977).

Thus, the "community" in community control referred to a governing patron group. "Collaboration" meant constituent implementation approval.

As a result, the site researcher reported that the project's philosophical and educational concepts were not understood by clients. Clients were not familiar with project goals, language, or ongoing activities. The patron-client pattern of relationship did not provide the support necessary to withstand the subsequent shocks of a rapidly changing student population and budget setbacks. Other than within a small group of clients, the project has not engendered sustained, broad-based support.

Case Number 7: The Minneapolis Extension Project

In 1973, the Minneapolis Public School System Board of Education and the University of Wisconsin College of Education collaboratively developed an area center for teacher (public school) development. The center primarily provided in-service staff development workshops, pre-service teacher training activities, and a teacher referral and placement service. In responding to the Agency's request for proposals, an extension project was collaboratively developed and drafted by the subsequent principal investigator, a public school system coordinator, a University of Wisconsin School of Education staff development specialist, and the in-service coordinator for the alternative schools in southeast Minneapolis. The project intended to extend the teacher center model to alternative school systems.

After a little more than two years, constituents concluded that the extension project had not achieved sustained incorporation at the alternative school sites. The extensionist strategy seems directly associated with the outcome of the project:

> Many problems arose from the external generation of the project. The fact that the teacher center was created in another area and simply 'given' to people resulted in problems of acceptance and ownership (Sherlock 1977).

Further, it was not so much the fact of extensionism that was influential as it is the accompanying patron-client patterns of participant relationship. In a fashion similar to the preceding Louisville project, the technical assistance group went against local school community problem definitions. Teachers, for example, wanted to focus project effort on the improvement of classroom pedagogy. The technical assistance group did not include a strategy focus on classrooms themselves.

This project illustrates the manner in which patrons seek to increase their prestige and influence through the replication of previously successful projects. Externally developed projects seem to be under pressure from their patrons to develop successful replications. In this hierarchical pattern of relationship, local school community groups assume secondary or even tertiary importance. Interestingly, the technical assistance group became a client to a larger patron:

> The situation was one in which the (new) Center

> staff viewed the (parent) Center as a 'rich and snobbish stepsister' (Sherlock 1977).

Subtly, the extended projects only served to enhance the prestige and reputation of their patron. The clients in the extended centers, not being colleagues in problem definition or strategy design, felt they merely served as a "laboratory" for the testing and evaluation of <u>their</u> patron's strategy:

> It is clear from the data presented in the case study that the client population never felt ownership of, or identification with, the Center. Among the confusion and lack of understanding, there were feelings of suspicion. There was a sense that the whole project had been 'laid on' by 'outsiders'.... The suspicion toward outsiders was that the project was probably more to the benefit of the University people than to the clients (Sherlock 1977).

The sense of isolation felt here was spatially expressed. The satellite Centers were isolated from the model Center and from the four client alternative schools, as well as from their parent, student, and community constituents. Colleague patterns of participant relationship are enhanced through face-to-face, site-specific interaction over comparatively long periods of time. In Minneapolis the technical assistance group spent comparatively little time in the new Centers or in the client schools. Even in its second year, Agency representatives were being called

upon to explain project goals and strategy to local school community constituents. The strategy of extensionism seems to contract the Agency's emphasis upon the local community generation of school improvement projects.[7] Local school community clients in the new Centers complained of never really understanding how the project could help resolve the classroom problems they continued to deem important. The Minneapolis extensionism project degenerated into merely a source of funding for staff-development proposals. Mutual mistrust severed further opportunity for ongoing colleague relationships.

Case 8: The Cultural Continuity Project

In 1968, the subsequent project principal investigator was attempting to understand and resolve persistent problems of high levels of school absenteeism and drop-out rates, the mutual anxieties and fears of parents and teachers, and students' low academic performance. Employing a psychological approach, a series of child-centered community action programs was developed. An educational consortium of local community groups was formed. The Consortium expanded upon the original psychocultural model in continuing to work with local school groups. At this time, activist parents, through school and district committees, had been agitating for basic improvement in local school environments. In 1974, the consortium organized parental concerns as impetus for drafting a project proposal in response to the Federal Education Agency request for proposals.

The aim of the funded project was to increase the effectiveness of

participants previously active in school improvement efforts. Existing school and community resources would be mobilized to better meet student needs. This project was based on a recognition of the cultural and ethnic heterogeneity of urban school communities as itself a contributing factor to urban school ineffectiveness. An assumption was that urban school failure is a result of the discontinuity between the student's native culture and the culture of the school. Urban schooling is ineffective to the degree that there is a lack of interaction and collaboration between subculturally diverse constituent groups. The primary purpose of the project was to render schools more responsive to the needs of the child. Site schools and personnel volunteered to participate in the project.

The technical assistance group, the Cultural Continuity Project, is composed of a local research center, a medical center, a community hospital, and local school groups. The Board of Directors is composed of the principal investigator, the project director, the project school principals, and parent and teacher representatives. The project strategy was to develop workshops employing psychological and cultural approaches to conceptualizing and understanding the interrelationship of school, home, and community. Child development theory provided a model about which the school should be made to function. Workshops and seminars encouraged participants to discuss and define their respective roles: to identify the child's physical, emotional, academic, and social needs; to identify the barriers to the satisfaction of those needs; then to locate the school, community, or consultant resources to meet those needs. Administrators were to be trained to view the school

as a system that either blocks or satisfies the needs of the child. Administrators were then expected to come to better understand the child's culture at home and its relationship to the school. Parents were to be helped to understand the language, norms, expectations, and operating procedure of the school. These workshops were designed to lessen the fears school staff had of parents and, conversely, that parents had of the school.

Local school constituents were not involved in the conception or design of the problem-solving strategy. Prior to the funded project though, both the principal investigator and project director spent considerable time in and gained considerable experience from the local community. Parents and the technical assistance group thus were able to develop a common approach to school change. However, the teachers came to be viewed as the adversary of this group. The alignment between parents, community representatives, and the technical assitance group made the strategy unacceptable to the instructional staff. The technical assistance group failed to include all local school participants in the process of problem identification and strategy designs so that these local constituents would feel supportive of the project.

Colleague Patterns of Participant Relationship in Public School Technical Assistance Projects

There are alternatives. In contrast to the preceding patron-client

pattern, there is a model of a colleague pattern of relationship. A conceptualization of colleagueship is provided by Foster (1967: 217):

> 'Colleague' contracts... tie people of equal or approximately equal socioeconomic position, who exchange the same kinds of goods and services. Colleague contracts are phrased horizontally, and can be thought of as symmetrical, since each partner, in position and obligations, mirrors the other....

The traditional definition of colleagueship is of structural homogeneity. Colleagues perceive each other as equals (Argyris 1961). This posture is often voluntary, collaborative, and democratic. The pattern connotes friendship and partnership (Reina 1959; Wolf 1966).

It is difficult to achieve a colleague pattern of relationship among structural unequals (see Nieoff and Charnel 1964). Traditional patterns of subgroup relationship must be initially recognized and consciously reorganized. Again, all patrons are elite, but all elites are not patrons. It is elite status and knowledge that provides access to strategic resources. In educational change projects, assuming a colleague role does not mean that technical assistance groups forego elite status. The difference is the manner in which elite status is manifested--how elite status is translated into interpersonal patterns of relationship. In the colleague role, elite technical assistance groups assume that people can (and should) identify and pose solutions to their own problems. At the

beginning of a project, a colleague pattern of relationship would be characterized by collaborative problem identification and diagnosis, strategy design, and proposal development (Lewin 1952; Thelen 1967). The technical assistance group would serve a consultant role. Traditional local school clients become colleagues (Boehm 1956; Pelz 1955). This pattern of relationship would be characterized by mutual feelings of identification with and acceptance of the project.[8] The following open-education technical assistance project will serve as example.

Case Number 9: The Responsive Education Project

In 1967 Dr. Marian Barber, the present project director, reorganized five Bricktown elementary school classrooms around an open-corridor Responsive Education plan. After three years' experience, an Assistors Service was formed in order to institutionalize a support system for the open education strategy. In 1972, a University Center was formed on the campus of Central University. The Center provided off-site support for the open education projects. In responding to the Federal Education Agency request for proposals, Dr. Barber proposed to increase and refine the existing open education model. A grant was made to the Assistors' Service and University Center through the Research Foundation at Central University.

This case study illustrates an intervention strategy involving the reorganization of traditional classrooms into a decentralized arrangement linked through the employment of hallways as a planned learning environment.

Traditional classroom organization and curriculum were considered unsupportive of the learning process. In each corridor community, classroom doors would remain open. Four or five classes, from kindergarten through sixth grade, would share a common setting. The basic assumption here is that accessibility itself reinforces interaction enhancing the educational process. Previously isolated constituents pool and share teaching techniques, materials, space, energy, ideas, and activities. The Assistors Service places consultants in those public schools where preexisting programs or activities have initiated activities toward the self-support of open education programs and have sought the consultantship of the technical assistance group. Constituents--be they students, parents, administrators, or teachers--voluntarily participate in open education projects.

The objective of this strategy was to increase the heterogeneity of the learning environment. As a philosophy, open education supports participation, community, and patterns of interaction lacking in traditional classrooms. Traditional age graded curriculums were set aside. Similar to the Cultural Continuity Project, this project was based on the philosophy that the school exists to support the developmental potential of each student. Key goals were the support of parent involvement in the educational process, the generation of a democratic learning environment, and voluntary participation.

A colleague pattern of relationship is illustrated. Elite and non-elite role relationships are phrased <u>across</u> status groups. This project is based on a philosophic stance of democratic education. In the previous

case studies, elites were synonymous with patrons. Here there is continuity between project intention and project reality. It is values, attitudes, and the personal stances among diverse participant subgroups that are crucial:

> The attitude toward (clients) is not one of condescension but of collaboration with them and reliance upon their unique contribution to the learning process in children and for the more sensitive development of teacher attitudes towards children (Karunakaran 1977).

The project is based on mutual communication, rapport, credibility, visibility, trust, and familiarity among all constituents. The emphasis on voluntary participation distinguishes it from other strategies:

> Thus, the project was not a University or department undertaking, but the idea of an individual working within its structure. This would set it apart from other programs which are University 'experiments' in the community. It was not a package that was being tested or delivered to the community...its earliest manifestation was in a public school. Thus, it was not created in a laboratory situation and then applied to the school situation (Ibid).

Clients sought out the technical assistance group. Strategies were not

imposed. There was mutuality of approach to school problem solving. Schools experimenting with child-centered education sought out technical assistance groups experienced in this strategy:

> Thus it appears that the Project and its claims 'matched' each other--parents were looking for an educational program that would honor cultural, ethnic, racial, and personal diversity, and the program expressed and was able to demonstrate these goals as being at the basis of its strategy for school reorganization (Ibid).

And again, very similar to the preceding project:

> The basic premise of the project is that it is a continuation and refinement of the informal learning provided by parents in the home (Ibid).

If this pattern rather than imposition be the case, then the support generated for the project is understandable. Participants were related as colleagues rather than as partrons and as clients. There existed a common value base about child development and education:

> The significant general observation that needs to be made in this section is that, in the schools where the project has made most progress, there has been a proper match between project goals and local school community interests and preferences... The project expanded upon and refined the community's

own projections for its schools (Ibid).

This approach is to be contrasted with previously described patron-client patterns of imposing, regardless of client wishes, a school improvement strategy. Here, participants were involved in problem definition and strategy design. The technical assistance group provided implementation assistance. The technical assistance group engaged in face-to-face collaboration (Roper and Nolan 1977). There were no brokers. Advisory personnel were placed directly in the schools. The project's goals and strategies were broadly advertised. Constituents worked together and in so doing came to share the project:

> The philosophy and strategy of the Responsive Education project is expressed and implemented through the use of a language that appears to define this group. This language is shared by teachers, parents, administrators, and project staff members (Karunakaran 1977).

A final consideration. Initially, I suggested that this educational research effort would yield evidence bearing upon the modification of the theory used by way of explanation. Indeed, cross-site analysis of the case study material suggests an elaboration of patron-client theory.

Foster's (1961; 1963; 1967) and Wolf's (1956; 1966) model of patron-client relationship is based on the recognition of exclusively dyadic ties and contracts. A dyadic relationship is a direct relationship involving some form of ongoing interaction between two individuals (Lande 1977: xiii). This emphasis on exclusively dyadic relationships suggests a static,

unilineal pattern. For example, peasants might be studied only in terms of dyadic relationships with individual hacienda landlords.

The suggestion here is that a more adequate conceptualization of the patron-client pattern involves the consideration of multiple, hierarchical levels of relationship. The pattern of relationship is multiple and processural rather than static and unilineal. Patrons and clients exist on multiple dyadic levels. For example, consider the manner in which local school technical assistance groups themselves were clients to a hierarchically different sets of patrons. The technical assistance personnel associated with the preceeding patron-client case studies were not mercenary or duplicit people out to disparage local school personnel. One must consider that the technical assistance groups were themselves clients. The Federal Education Agency stipulated the direction and format taken by the technical assistance effort. Budgets and time-span were set by the Agency. In the form of grants, technical assistance groups continually seek the favor of wealthy patrons. In turn, funding sources such as the Federal Education Agency are often clients to wider, intergovernmental agencies. Patron-client patterns of relationship exist on ever expanding vertical levels of hierarchical arrangement. Theoretically, the apex of the hierarchy is the State itself--the maximal patron. Especially within complex bureaucratic structures, patron-client theory must be reconceptualized so as to recognize the hierarchical structure in which more basic dyadic relationships are framed.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A purpose of the preceding discussion has been to focus attention on the influence of patterns of participant relationship on the character of school improvement efforts. The use of anthropological theory in the analysis of cross-site data suggests the need for more collaboratively designed local school improvement proposals, strategies, and projects as well as the need for associated colleague patterns of constituent relationship. Participants must develop and adopt mutually satisfying relationships as a precondition to implementation of the project itself. Patterns of project subgroup constituent relationship expressing mutual trust and respect, complementary roles, and shared goals are a necessary but not sufficient condition for a successful approach to the resolution of persistent school problems.

That the importance of relationship patterns is not routinely recognized is demonstrated in the infrequency with which funding proposals reflect a concern with reinforcing structures for more effective patterns of subgroup interrelationship. Federal Education Agency funded projects were specifically intended to foster collaborative approaches to the development of local school-improvement strategies. Case analysis shows that most patterns of constituent relationship were opposite to stated project intent. "Collaboration" usually referred to the local school community post hoc acceptance of a technical assistance group's a priori change strategy. Patron-client patterns of participant relationship

engender mutual resentments subtly undermining the effectiveness of an otherwise appropriate improvement strategy.

I conclude that if the diverse participants in (especially urban) local school-improvement projects view and behave toward each other as colleagues, then ongoing attempts at problem solving will be more effective than would otherwise be the case. As deduced from the Responsive Education case study, significant elements of a colleague pattern of constituent relationship include: collaborative design of funding; proposals; constituent involvement--feelings of ownership of the project; shared purpose; mutual respect, acceptance, and trust; mutually acceptable role divisions; and decision making by concensus (Nolan and Roper 1977).

Cross-site (ethnological) analysis suggests four strategies for the development of colleague patterns of constituent relationship. A group, external to the local school community, can more effectively facilitate the development of a locally defined problem-solving strategy by taking into consideration the following:

1. Local Definition of the Problem to be Solved.

Resource and technical assistance ought to focus on those local school communities having initially defined the educational problems to be solved. A colleague-based technical assistance effort is characterized by the absence of problem definition from outside the local school community. Although the Federal Education Agency sought to support the development of local capacities for the solution of problems in education,

most of the school-improvement strategies reviewed here did not exhibit locally defined or collaboratively developed problem-solving strategies. Further, the importation or extension of problem definition and improvement strategies contradicted an Agency mandate on the local development of improvement strategies.

Extensionist projects reinforce patron-client patterns of relationship; therefore, any extensionism should be collaboratively developed and monitored. Each local school community is a specific, particular constellation of variables differing from site to site. Strategies successful in one site should be extended only if they show some adaptative fit with existing situations in the present local school community. Technical assistance personnel should only recommend those traits already adapted to particular problem constellations.

Case study analysis further reveals that projects building upon preexisting, locally developed strategies were more sustaining and mutually satisfying than were projects with strategies imported from extralocal sources. Problem-solving strategies should be collaboratively developed in response to locally defined problems. The assumption is that local school communities are the best people to define their own problems. Serving in a consulting colleague role, technical assistance groups would help clients to better identify their own problems (Argyris 1961). Technical assistance groups would be in a better position to be aware of approaches to the solution of the problem as defined. This group would present problem solving alternatives to the local community. Employing

elite access channels, technical assistance groups would recommend to local school constituents the value of other existing problem-solving approaches and techniques. The technical assistance group must not assume that it has all the answers for the school. The role of the technical assistance group is assisting--not professing. The advisory group must adopt a position of relativity and maintain a nonjudgmental, nonevaluative, nonsupervisory posture.

2. The Selection of Appropriate Technical Assistance.

Based on the nature of its problems, the local school community would seek out appropriate technical assistance personnel and resources. Local school communities would seek out colleagues rather than patrons. The local school community would form relationships with technical assistance personnel whose experiences were consistent with their locally defined values and needs. The technical assistance group becomes a source for the legitimacy of the proposed change project, a source of ideas and expertise, a source of support, a source for consultants, and a source for funding leads and contacts. The local school community draws on the elite contacts of the technical assistance group. The technical assistance group serves as a vehicle for organizing resources around the solution of locally defined problems. The pattern of relationship I am suggesting is one of colleagues, each with different sets of knowledge and skills, collaborating in the execution or refinement of a strategy and problem defined by the local school community. Adoption of a colleague pattern of

relationship enhances the desirability of technical assistance personnel adjusting themselves to the established framework of the school.

3. Pre-project Feasibility Proposals.

These issues precede and exist apart from the relative effectiveness of any particular improvement strategy. The structure of constituent patterns of relationship preceding actual implementation of a project strategy is as important as are the various solutions posed to the problems themselves. The character of participant relationship is a precondition to effective project implementation. Matters of collaboration and collegiality typically are considered after the implementation of the problem-solving strategy.

Funding agencies should seek to develop what I will term preproject feasibility grants--grants specifically designed to develop participant structures conducive to more effective local school-improvement projects. A preproject grant would be a proposal to collaboratively develop a proposal. Participants would propose to structure specific patterns of (colleague) participant relationship as a precondition to consideration for a school-improvement grant. This strategy would reinforce the development of colleague patterns of relationship and the collaborative development of school-improvement projects. Following the categories suggested here, funding agencies could rigorously review preproject final reports to assess if the proposed strategies were truly collaboratively developed and if structures had developed for the colleague implementation and execution of

the preposed project. Funding agencies would site test the preproject final report for discernable, colleague patterns of participant relationship. Those projects with demonstrable colleague structures would be funded under a separate grant awarded for the project itself.

4. Ethnographic Methods and Collegiality

Technical assistance groups ought to make more conscious use of ethnographic methods and techniques in developing collaborative, colleague-based approaches to resolving educational problems. Because of the heterogeneous nature of the urban situation, school-improvement projects and their constituencies are more profitably seen as a cross/subculture contact situation. Ethnographic research techniques reinforce shared knowledge and consciousness bridging constituent gaps of culture, schooling, and class. Ethnographic methodology requires careful attention to matters of entry into a different culture, of establishing an acceptable identity and role, of establishing rapport with constituents, of personal adjustment to the local culture, of the empirical identification of relevant constituent groups, and of the establishment of credibility. Ethnographic approaches stress the direct participant observation of and contact with constituent groups. The rationale is that one only comes to know and understand the way of life of others by directly experiencing the situations producing their reality. As much as possible, the intent is to share in the assumptions, language, and goals of the people with whom one is working. The point of departure is the people themselves--the local

situation (Wilson et al. 1974).[9]

Thus, my claim is that the effectiveness of any particular change theory and strategy will be associated with the degree of descriptive, on-site ethnographic-like research in the local school setting. This requires face-to-face rather than broker-type interaction. Technical assistance personnel must develop an ethnographer-like empathy toward and sensitivity to the unique styles of each local school community. The technical assistance group must also develop awareness of the impact of their presence on local school constituents.

In ethnographic fashion local school settings must be viewed within the context of the local community as well as the larger society and culture. Very early in the formation of a technical assistance project, extensive knowledge about the characteristics of the local school community must be gathered. Effective technical assistance would be associated with in-depth firsthand knowledge and understanding of local school particulars--before suggesting problem-solving strategies.

Preproject proposals would require on-site knowledge of individual local school communities. We have seen projects suffer from a lack of on-site technical assistance presence. An ethnographic approach would reinforce contact, mutuality, reciprocity, sharing, dialogue, familiarity, credibility, legitimacy, trust, and respect among the diverse participant groups. These attributes are not extendable or exportable. Legitimacy and respect are site-specific. The development of a colleague pattern of relationship alone, and its attendant attributes, might take an

ethnographer months to develop. Like ethnographic fieldwork, technical assistance cannot proceed until trust is established. Technical assistance groups, local school constituents, and funding agencies must realize that the antecedents to an effective school-improvement project take time to develop. The methodology and techniques employed by ethnographic anthropologists in conducting cross-cultural behavioral research have clear relevance and direct applicability to the establishment of colleague patterns of relationship in educational change projects.

Over the past several decades, cultural anthropologists in the United States have received a warm welcome from educators interested in better understanding and improving the effectiveness of formal educational systems. The emergent subdiscipline of educational anthropology carries on the tradition of anthropology as synthesis mediating theory and practice. Applied educational research continues to make extensive use of ethnological modes of analysis as well as use of ethnographic research methods and techniques. The intent of this chapter has been to provide an example of the manner in which anthropological theory informs current educational practice. Reflexively, data gleened from anthropological work in applied educational settings informs anthropological theory.

Anthropologists continue to seek resolution to the problems that seem to persistently plague humankind. With this humanistic mandate, legitimate divisions between the theoretical and the applied are not easily rendered.

Endnotes

1. Site names and the names of individual projects are pseudonyms.

2. A summary of the timeline for the activities described here are as follows:

September 1974	FEA funded activity in the nine sites begins.
January 1975	FEA selected for documentation
April 1975	Site researchers begin studying each school improvement strategy.
July 1976	Site researchers begin writing drafts of case studies that document their period of observation. Ongoing nonparticipant observation of funded strategies. Consultation with coordinators. Ongoing modification of field research.
June 1977	FEA funding for the nine sites ends. Site researchers begin writing final drafts of case studies incorporating critiques of first drafts and new data gathered from second period of nonparticipant observation.

3. I am attempting to maintain some measure of confidentiality here. At this writing, final copies of each case study are on file at the

Consortium for Educational Research. Readers interested in securing copies of any case study are asked to contact the author. Individual letters will be forwarded to the Consortium.

4. Descriptive studies on the preimplementation phase of school intervention strategies are still quite rare. Prevailing emphasis is on the longitudinal study of the project itself. When they do occur, a recent RAND report (Berman 1975:3) notes that:

> the literature paints project accomplishments in glowing broadbrush terms but it provides little information about specific successful strategies, about the components necessary to success, or even about what constitutes success.

5. Accounts of more objective activities such as problem identification and strategy design were derived from funding proposals, conference working papers, minutes from project meetings, and other document analysis.

6. Quotations are taken from unpublished fieldnotes and case study drafts researchers forwarded to Documentation offices.

7. Extensionism's rationale directly contradicts the indigenous, collaborative development of school-improvement strategies:

> Underlying the predominant change efforts of the 1960's was a rational and mechanistic model of the change process. It is assumed that if new educational

> products were developed...they could easily be 'installed' in the schools. Schools tended to be viewed as machines into which new parts needed to be fitted. Thus, the parts could be prepared elsewhere (in the research and development laboratories or in federal planning departments) and then disseminated to a passive adopting group in local schools (Moore et al. 1977:5).

8. Havelock's (1969) problem-solver model forecasts the effectiveness of colleague patterns of participant relationship.

9. On ethnographic techniques, see Pelto (1970) and Williams (1967).

References Cited

Argyris, Chris

1961 Explorations in Consulting-Client Relationships. Human Organization 20: 121-133.

Becker, Ernest

1971 Sketch for a Critical History of Anthropology. In The Lost Science of Man. Pp. 71-157. New York: George Braziller.

Belshaw, Cyril

1970 The Adaptation of Personnel Policies in Social Context. In Labor Commitment and Social Change in Developing Areas. Wilbert E. Moore and Arnold S. Feldman, eds. Pp. 92-108. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Berman, Paul

1975 Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Volume 5, Executive Summary. Washington D.C.: United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Boehm, W.W.

1956 The Professional Relationship between Consultant and Consultee. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 26:241-248.

Boissevain, Jeremy

1966 Patronage in Spain. Man 1: 18-33.

Bottomore, Thomas B.

1964 Elites and Society. London: Watts.

Brameld, Theodore and Edward B. Sullivan

1961 Anthropology and Education. Review of Educational Research 31: 70-79.

Brown, Robert P.

1977 River City Imaginative Educational Cooperative Project (No. 4). Case study draft. Chicago: Consortium for Educational Research.

Burnett, Jacquetta H. with the collaboration of Sally W. Gordon and Carol J. Gormley

1974 Anthropology and Education: An Annotated Bibliographic Guide. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files Press.

Clark, Woodrow

1977 El Dorado Faculty Development Project (No. 5). Fieldnotes. Chicago: Consortium for Educational Research.

Coehn, Yehudi A.

1971 The Shaping of Men's Minds: Adaptations to Imperatives to Culture. In Anthropological Perspectives on Education. Murray L. Wax, Stanley Diamond, and Fred O. Gearing, eds. Pp. 19-50. New York: Basic Books.

Davis, Jacqueline Peek

1977 New York Coalition for Business and Education Collaboration: School Self-Improvement Project (No. 1). Fieldnotes. Chicago: Consortium for Educational Research.

Foster, George M.

1961 The Dyadic Contract: A Model for the Social Structure of a Mexican Peasant Village. American Anthropologist 63: 1173-1192.

1963 The Dyadic Contract in Tzintzuntzan, II; Patron-Client Relationship. American Anthropologist 65: 1280-1294.

1967 Tzintzuntzan: Mexican Peasants in a Changing World. Boston: Little Brown.

Gellner, Ernest and John Waterbury, eds.

1977 Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies. London: Duckworth.

Gilsenan, Michael

1977 Against Patron-Client Relationships. In Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies. Ernest Gellner and John Waterbury, eds. Pp. 167-184. London: Duckworth.

Gordon, Gerry

1977 Federal City Junior High School Network Project (No. 2). Case study draft. Chicago: Consortium for Educational Research.

Havelock, Ronald G.

1969 Planning for Innovation Through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge. Ann Arbor: Center for Research on the Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Karunakaran, Chitra

1971 New York Responsive Education Program (No. 9). Fieldnotes. Chicago: Consortium for Educational Research.

Kenny, Michael

1960 Patterns of Patronage in Spain. Anthropological Quarterly 33: 14-23.

Kimball, Solon T.

1965 The Transmission of Culture. Educational Horizons 43: 161-186.

Lande, Carl H.

1977 Introduction: The Dyadic Basis of Clientelism. In Friends, Followers, and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism. Schmidt, Steffan W. et al., eds. Pp. xiii-xxxvii. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lewin, Kurt

1952 Group Decision and Social Change. In Readings in Social Psychology. G.E. Swanson et al., eds. Pp. 459-473. New York: Henry Holt.

Nieoff, Arthur H. and Anderson J. Charnel

1964 The Process of Cross-Cultural Innovation. International Development Review 6:5-11.

Nolan, Robert R. and Susan Stavert Roper

1977 Translating Research into Practice: Suggestions for Working with Practitioners. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New York, April 1977.

Ogbu, John U.

1974 Taxpayers and Burghersiders in Patron-Client Relationships. In The Next Generation: An Ethnography of Education in an Urban Neighborhood. Pp. 49-57. New York: Academic Press.

Paoli, Lilliam

1977 New York Neighborhood Corporation for Educational Improvement (No. 6). Fieldnotes. Chicago: Consortium for Educational Research.

Pelto, Pertti J.

1970 Anthropological Research: The Structure of Inquiry. New York: Harper and Row.

Pelz, Edith Bennett

1955 Discussion, Decision, Commitment, and Consensus in 'Group Decision.' Human Relations 8:251-278.

Reina, Ruben

1959 Two Patterns of Friendship in Guatemalan Community. American Anthropologist 61:44-50.

Roper, Susan Stavert and Robert R. Nolan

1977 Down from the Ivory Tower: A Model of Collaborative In-Service Education. Stanford, California: Occasional Paper No. 16, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

Schmidt, Steffan W., Laura Guasti, Carl H. Lande, and James C. Scott, eds.

1977 Fr ends, Followers, and Factions; A Reader in Political Clientelism. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sherlock, Steven

1977 Iroquois City Program for Satellite Teacher Center (No. 7). Fieldnotes. Chicago: Consortium for Educational Research.

Silverman, Sydel F.

1965 Patronage and Community-Nation Relationships in Central Italy. Ethnology 4: 172-189.

Singleton, John

1974 Implications of Education as Cultural Transmission. In Education and Cultural Process: Toward an Anthropology of Education. George D. Spindler, ed. Pp. 26-38. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Thelen, Herbert A.

1967 Concepts for Collaborative Action-Inquiry. In Concepts for Social Change. G. Watson, ed. Washington, DC: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science.

Tindall, B. Allen

1976 Theory in the Study of Cultural Transmission. Annual Review of Anthropology 5: 195-208.

Washburn, Sherwood

1971 On the Importance of the Study of Primate Behavior for Anthropologists. In Anthropological Perspectives on Education. Murray L. Wax, Stanley Diamond, and Fred O. Gearing, eds. Pp. 91-97. New York: Basic Books.

Williams, Thomas R.

1972 Introduction to Socialization: Human Culture Transmitted. St. Louis: The C.V. Mosby Co.

Wilson, Stephen, Richard Johnson, Thomas Wilson, Emile Schepers, Donald Moore, Phyllis Wilson, Monica Ingram and Hazel Domangue

1974 A Review of the Use of Ethnographic Techniques in Educational Research. Chicago: Center for New Schools.

Wolf, Eric R.

1956 Aspects of Group Relations in a Complex Society: Mexico. American Anthropologist 58: 1065-1078.

1966 Kinship, Friendship, and Patron-Client Relationships in Complex Societies. In The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies, Michael Banton, ed. Pp. 1-22. London: Tavistock Publications.